

# INTERNATIONAL

# REVIEW

AUGUST  
1936

Vol. 1 No. 6  
15c

INSIDE STORY of SPANISH REVOLT

◆ *Inter*  
◆ *Or*

LITERATURE and DRAMA ◆ *George Plekhanov*  
Unpublished Essay

OPEN LETTER TO ANDRÉ GIDE ◆ *Victor Serge*

FRENCH MASSES and PEOPLE'S FRONT ◆ *Pierre Monatte*

STRANGE CASE of JACQUES DORIOT ◆ *N. Sentier*

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT and SOCIALISM ◆ *Rosa Luxemburg*

BOOKS: "Goodbye to Soviet Russia" by A. Rudolf  
"Dialectics" by Dr. Edward Conze, T. A. Jackson

---

---

*The World's Most Significant Thought and Action*

# The World As It Is

## ECCE HOMO

"I am 27 years old, fully mature. I have attained a distinct personality, in spite of all education. And I possess the unshakable will to become more—to develop into a Superman of the kind foreseen by Nietzsche. My country is that of Peter Rosegger in the North, of Rudolf Hans Bartsch in the South; I live in the East. By occupation a land cultivator, deeply attached to the soil and hardened in tireless activity, both inner and exterior.

"The woman who one among millions of women considers herself to be my equal may announce that she is ready to marry me. She must be of the Nordic race (pure stock) and should possess enough money to establish a rural home. Agents need not bother. Write to Ecce Homo, 3469, Kiel, Neuste Nachrichten."

Taken from "Kieler Neuste Nachrichten," Kiel, Germany.

## FOR LITTLE CHILDREN

The teaching of arithmetic in the schools of the entire world tends to base arithmetical problems on the reality that the child can see every day.

Let us see how the German schools satisfy this postulate of new pedagogy.

In the newest arithmetic book we find the following problems for pupils of the third grade (junior high school):

1. Day bombers fly at a speed of 280 kilometers an hour; night bombers fly at a speed of 240 km. Calculate how long it will take them to complete the distance between Wroclaw and Prague, between Munich and Strasbourg, between Cologne and Metz.

2. A squadron composed of 46 bombers drops bombs on an enemy city. Each plane is provided with 500 bombs weighing 1,500 gr. Calculate the weight of all the bombs. How many fires will result if one bomb out of three explodes and it takes 20 explosions to cause a fire?

3. The allies of Germany have mobilized 11½ million soldiers. The Germans alone have mobilized during the four and a half years of war 13,250,000 men and youths. The enemies of Germany have mobilized 47,000,000 soldiers. How many enemies were there for each ten soldiers of the Central States? The World War lasted 1,563 days. How many soldiers sacrificed their lives: 1. daily; 2. hourly? How many died every minute?

4. In 1934 France spent 10½ billions of francs for armaments. France has a population of 42,000,000.

During the same period the Germans spent 650 million marks. Germany has a population of 66,000,000. How much per inhabitant was spent in 1. France, 2. in Germany?

6. Up to the 16th of March 1935, Germany had a frontier of 6,000 km., guarded by 100,000 soldiers, while France had 600,000 soldiers to guard 2,700 km. With what density of soldiers could each of the two countries provide its frontier? How many soldiers should Germany have had?

—Swiat, Warsaw.

## AND HE SURE TAKES NO WOODEN NICKELS

The sayings of "uncle" Landon have been collected in a booklet. There are found in it pearls of this sort: "Better two dollars in your own pocket than ten in somebody else's pocket."—Marianne, Paris.

## PLATINUM BLONDES TO THE GUILLOTINE

The French Revolution, made by men of the lowest level, being the diabolic work of the human refuse from the South of France, and corrupted from the racial viewpoint, has naturally been aided in every way by the Jews. Did not the reprobate Mirabeau address the National Assembly in behalf of the Jews, who then became citizens in 1791?

In order to bring about this result, thousands of Frenchmen of the superior Aryan and Nordic strata were beheaded by the blood-thirsty Jacobins, who were directed by the sheenies. It was enough for any person to have a blond head and he or she was led away to the guillotine.—Der S.A. Mann, Berlin.

## THE HAPPY COMMUNARDS ARE DEAD

"On the 24th of May I saw a strange happening at the Mur des Fédérés, where thousands of Communards were shot down in 1871 by the butcher Gallifet. At the great popular demonstration assembled to do honor to the dead of 1871, the tricolor and the red flag figured in blending profusion over the worker contingents that continued to pour by. There was a spirit of fervent comradeship in that great assembly. The Communists cheered the Socialists; the Socialists raised fraternal clenched fists to their new friends. All of a sudden there hove in sight the ranks of the anarchist organizations, bearing their black flag. A moan of hatred arose among the Communists. Their "defense corps" attacked the bearers of the flag. The anarchists defended themselves. Then lo and behold! the hammer and sickle functionaries ran to the police. The police sailed in to aid the cause of law and order, smashing the anarchist workers left and right. Then a great cry of joy went up from the mass of Soviet followers: "La police avec nous! Vive la police! Vive l'armée!" (The police is with us! Long live the police! Long live the army!) Their joy was so spontaneous. I was touched.

"I shall not give you the stock: "If the Martyrs of Père-Lachaise could see!" I know they cannot see, hear or—reflect on the irony of history. The fortunate dead!

It rhymes: *La police avec nous!*

*Les soviets partout!*

—A. T., Paris.

## DEFENSE OF BREAD; RESPECT FOR LAW

The tricolor fraternizes with the red flag over the factories. The workers are unanimous in their support of the general demands: Croix de Feu, white Russians, foreigners, socialists, communists, all fraternally united in the defense of bread and respect for the law.—Marcel Cachin, *l'Humanité*, 30th of May, 1936.

## HOT NEWS

FRANCE AND BELGIUM RAPIDLY GOING RED; SCENES OF HORROR. Rioting, Bloodshed and Misery; Strikers' Excesses. Tourists in Fear of Their Lives.

—London Sunday Dispatch, June 21, 1936.

## A FACSIMILE OF STALIN'S NOSE IS SUGGESTED

After the promulgation of the new constitution, the emblem of the Soviet Union is going to be changed.

The hammer and sickle—which Western communists still wear in their lapels—has been found to be "out of date." "It no longer symbolizes," declares the official press, "our new means of production."—Marianne, Paris.

# Behind the Revolt in Spain

• Inter

ON THE EVE of the monarcho-fascist military revolt *La Batalla* of Barcelona warned in its leader:

*The political-social situation is fast growing graver. Everything is going awry. Everything functions with difficulty, or simply does not function.*

*After three months of life, the present Cortes is done for. An abyss is widening between the Parliament and the country. The Cortes continues to discuss juridical problems, pensions, trifles, while down below are hunger, want, anxiety, intense uneasiness and the fever of revolution.*

*Our government is sterile and artificial. Sterile because it is incapable of producing anything useful, because it performs fancy tricks on a loose rope, in its desire to avoid revolution, though it owes its existence precisely to a revolutionary movement.*

*The government is acting through the medium of two instruments that do not obey its command: the State apparatus and the Popular Front.*

*The State apparatus—comprising the army, Civil Guard, police, courts, officials, etc.—does what it pleases. Its decisions are not determined in any way whatsoever by the government. The State machinery is in permanent insurrection against the government.*

*The Popular Front, on the other hand, finds itself facing a revolt of the laboring masses, who categorically refuse its order to mark time at the moment when it is plainly necessary to move fast.*

*And enfolding all is the formidable economic crisis, which is getting worse every day—the menace of an impending economic collapse of extraordinary proportions.*

*The situation could not be more disquieting, especially in view of the stark fact that the reactionary forces of the country have recovered their voices and are attacking energetically. They are attacking in the Parliament, on the street, in the Councils of the Administration, in the pulpits, in the national and foreign press, in the very organization of the State.*

*Only the laboring class can forestall the chaos that is preparing. Only the labor movement can stop the catastrophe. . .*

So there was Spain on the eve of a showdown. An economic crisis. A government whose hands and feet were being held fast by its own enemies. The peasant and worker population wanted help. They struck. They reached for land. They were told by the Popular Front staff to go easy, not to act rashly, lest the Popular Front and its government be imperilled. Said Prieto, speaking in the Cortes three weeks before the first news arrived from Morocco—and these were words to which Caballero and certainly the Communists and Republicans surely subscribed:

*"The work of the People's Front is a work of solidarity. If it fails, we shall all be crushed: ministers and deputies, republicans and Socialists, the Catalanian Esquerra and the Communists. Because what will collapse in that case will be the People's Front, and we shall all suffer from our own incompetence."*

By whom were the Popular Front and its government imperilled? By the rising action of the masses? By the fascists? The government and the Popular Front were imperilled by the reactionary forces—monarchist and catholic-conservative—in whose hands the State and administrative power continued to remain, though democracy had already won two consecutive signal victories in Spain.

Why did not the People's Front government change the personnel of its State apparatus? Did it not know the lessons taught by the experience of the German democratic republic? Why did it not overhaul the military machine, throwing out the monarchist generals and officers, on whom Azaña and his republican entourage, and all the brethren of the Popular Front, well knew they could not rely?

The following was the answer usually given:

*"It takes time to renovate a huge machine. A fast change will incite a revolt by the officer class. We shall be locked out, so to speak, by our own servants. What is an army without officers, without a command? But we are getting rid of the most objectionable generals, of those that were cruellest in October, 1934. And we are actually purging the police force. Indeed, we have created a new policing organization: the Assault Guards, which includes even Socialist and Communist recruits."*

Who were some of the generals that had been gotten rid of? Franco, Mola, Goded, Queipo de Llano. How were they gotten rid of? By being given military and administrative posts in outlying sections of the republic. Franco was sent to the Canaries. Goded to the Balearic Island. Llano to Morocco. But these are the heads of the military revolt? Right, the government had punished these gentlemen by giving them administrative and military posts in outlying districts of the republic where the poor exiles were out of the public eye but were enabled to continue in all comfort preparations for the coming military insurrection. (It is interesting to note that General Batet, "butcher" of the Asturian revolt of 1934, was recently named as chief of the sixth division of the army of the Republic.) And what was one of the very important functions of the newly created Assault Guards and the purged police force? To beat up C.N.T. agitators, who called on the workers not to be scared by the "Go easy!" counselled by the staff of the Popular Front, whose government dawdled while the population starved.

The consequence of this dawdling were the strikes, street fights between the Fascists and the leftists, the general disorder which Calvo Sotelo, the Monarchist ex-minister, so skillfully advertised to the "good" people of the country from the parliamentary tribune provided to him by the republic that he and his military friends were conspiring to smash out of existence with the professional might of the army.

The young José Antonio Primo de Rivera was not in it, so to speak. Gil Robles had been discredited even with the respectable Catholic circles of the country. The wealthy Catholic-Fascist youth did their bit in disreputable brawls in the city streets. Their activity merely helped to increase the impression of general disorder which Calvo Sotelo triumphantly pointed to as an object lesson for the people of Spain. Primo de Rivera was only a street "agitator," but Sotelo had become the recognized "jefe," the "statesman," the prospective civil dictator of the new government that was being planned.

Calvo Sotelo was the Minister of Inner Affairs during the elder de Rivera's dictatorship. He is the man who was responsible for the fall of the peseta. He was generously amnestied by the first republican Cortes. The Cortes of the Popular Front presented him with the opportunity of justifying to the country the destruction

of the democratic republic. More! When certain labor papers protested against Sotelo's provocative propaganda, their warnings were censored by the government.

We have already been told that the revolt was premature, that the army command did not plan to act till July 26, that their conspiracy was brought to a head by the news of the assassination of the chief, Calvo Sotelo. The young officers stationed in Morocco would not wait.

The July struggle is the defensive fight of a parliamentary government against the most powerful branch of its State apparatus,

the army. If the regular army is crushed in the fight, the result will be due to the heroic efforts of the workers and wide-awake elements among the peasantry. It will be the victory of a citizen army, a people's army, over the professional command of a modern army. Then the words of the *Batalla* will be said to have come true: "Only the labor movement can stop the catastrophe."

But the fact is that the catastrophe will continue to threaten even after the victory of the Popular Front government.

On the other hand, a victory of the reactionaries can only be temporary. There will then come a greater October.

## Causes of the Revolt and What Next • Or

A FEW DAYS before the Moroccan units were led by their officers into revolt against the government, a prominent labor deputy was asked by an interviewer: "Is there a serious menace of a *coup d'état* from the right?"

His answer was:

"No, the propitious moment has passed. The period of disorder—very threatening at times—is closed for the rights. The purification of the army and of the State apparatus will take away from them all possibility of action. Their present activity—terrorist attempts and threatening gestures—merely goes to prove their weakness."

We hope this deputy was speaking for effect. Remember that the Popular Front was planning to save the country from chaos by adjourning the Cortes for some time, by installing a "democratic dictatorship." There was much to hide from the newspapers. But it is quite possible that the experienced labor deputy just did not know. No, the propitious moment had not passed.

One might say that the murder of Calvo Sotelo helped to make the moment propitious. But it was Sotelo, a minister in the previous dictatorship, who was expected to become the head of the government established in case the plotted revolt met with success. The rebellion was not decided on in a few days. It was not brought into being by Calvo Sotelo's death. It was pushed ahead by his assassination, and by the slow weeding-out process that the government was cautiously performing in the army. Time after time Gil Robles and the same Sotelo took the occasion to tell the Cortes that murders, strikes, factional fighting were rife in the land. Why did Gil and Calvo Sotelo recite their lists? Obviously to justify to the country the coup that was being prepared by their allies in the army.

The army was not "purified" fast enough. A new police organization was created—the assault guards. But these were used in the suppression of C.N.T. strikes as well as to break up fascist riots. There was only one consistent way of purifying the army: dismissing all the old officers, creating a citizen army. But think of the possible consequences of a move of this sort. I do not believe that Azaña—who remains the real head of the democratic Spanish republic—was afraid that this step would have led to the seizure of the State by the population for the purpose of establishing a new social order. He was afraid that a rapid weeding-out would have been anticipated by an officers' rebellion.

If the reactionaries should triumph in Spain would the "syndicalists be largely responsible"? It is possible that Pestaña once said: "A strike is not conducted primarily for higher wages and better conditions. The Spanish workers have decided to grapple with capitalism. They have gathered sufficient strength to break away from democracy and destroy capitalism by striking here and here." That is the typical anarcho-syndicalist position. The same view-

point was expressed by representative French trade unionists at the time when Millerand played the role similar to that taken by Blum and the Spanish left republican ministers in our day. This viewpoint was taken over by the communist parties in 1919. It is important to note that Pestaña's outlook has somewhat changed. He wants a political democracy in Spain. He really expects to win the battle of libertarian socialism on the field of political democracy.

Not so the F.A.I., the Anarchist organization that dominates the C.N.T. just as the Communist Party dominated their own "red" trade unions. Our observer's criticism should have been directed to the F.A.I. Even in that case he would not be entirely correct. No matter what is the theoretic dressing, the fact is that the strikes participated in by the C.N.T. had one purpose—the immediate amelioration of the conditions of the workers. And the situation of the Spanish workers remained deplorable though Azaña's victory was supposedly theirs.

I doubt that even the F.A.I. is ready to stand by while old Primo de Rivera's gang takes State power back into its hands. During the Rivera dictatorship, the syndicalist organization was made illegal. In the present situation the C.N.T. is certain to do what they did in the Asturias in 1934: join their brothers to give battle to reaction.

No matter what happens, Pestaña's last statement remains true: "By limiting itself strictly to the economic field, syndicalism cannot answer the needs of revolution."

In case of the defeat of the military reactionaries, we may expect any of the following three eventualities in the Spanish labor movement. The great efforts made by the population and the realization that they have arms and power in their own hands may bring the mass to act quickly and directly in behalf of their own interests. It is possible that Azaña will then attempt to forestall another sort of revolt—now by the C.N.T. or a united left workers' combination—by rushing through his program of reforms.

Now the rebellion may have a sobering effect on the population. The consequent prevailing attitude of the masses may become that of lassitude and the fear of jeopardizing the democratic republic by any bold class act. Azaña and his republicans will then find their way easier. They will remain the government and continue to do what they did in 1931. Very little.

The third eventuality, hardly distinguishable from the second, is a government by Prieto's Socialist moderates. In that case, Caballero, backed by the Communists, will act to organize a new party. He had already attempted to make contacts with the C.N.T. at its congress in Zaragoza. The F.A.I. are quite ready to go along with Caballero in a popular rebellion for overthrowing the capitalist state. But the two will make untrustworthy allies, each always ready to outsmart the other. —Translated by A. T.

# French Masses and People's Front

• Pierre Monatte

From "Révolution Proletarienne," Paris:

**T**RADE UNION unity in France is the fruit of the 6th of October. It is a result of the menace of fascism. The People's Front is another consequence of the fascist menace.

Almost from the day of its birth, the People's Front bore a suspicious face. Let us go back a year. Two questions preoccupied us then. Stalin's declarations and Laval's decrees.

A solemn, grandiose demonstration on the 14th of July. But on the 16th, the publication of Laval's decrees on the reduction of the wages of public employees. There was no reaction to this, excepting the "wild" disorders at the Brest and Toulon arsenals two weeks later.

Stalin's declaration on the 15th of May 1935, "understanding and fully approving the policy of national defense followed by France in order to maintain its armed forces at the level suiting its needs of security" were applauded by the ever unanimous Communist Party, by Zyromski and all the Homo-Grumbach of the Socialist Party, and naturally also, by the radicals. [We know that when the right day comes the most jacobin among these gentlemen will be the most chauvinist.

For the Communist Party the turn was abrupt. The new order meant the abandonment of all opposition to the two-years military service, and the approval of the institution of three-years service. It meant backing the military measures of the Doumergue and Laval governments. It meant rallying to Berthou's policy of the encirclement of Germany and a preventive war. The order was executed most docilely. Are the communists leading us, to the singing of the *Marseillaise*, with the tricolor—the emblem of the bourgeoisie, the emblem of a departed historic period—into another war, to a so-called crusade against fascism and Hitler?

In order to destroy fascism in Germany, are we going to install it in France? War puts the country under the fist of militarism. Our general-staff is too sorry that it did not make greater use of the last war not to make the most of its opportunities in the next.

Therefore more and more comrades ask themselves if the People's Front is not a sinister swindle. Instead of bringing unity in order to resist the aggravation of the conditions of life will it not merely organize us for capitulation to the government's decrees? Instead of uniting us for peace and for opposition to war and fascism, which is essentially nationalism, is the People's Front merely ushering in the holy alliance of the coming war?

This uneasiness is quite legitimate. But it poses a grave question: Can a great popular movement be easily deviated from its goal by the leaders it has chosen or rather by leaders who have wished themselves on the movement?

The masses that were put in motion by the fascist menace of the 6th of February 1934, the workers, the peasants and the petty bourgeois mobilized by the People's Front, the hundreds of thousands of demonstrators who answered its appeals in the region of Paris, the millions of voters who sent a majority into Parliament, this vast mass is set in motion by a number of simple but great and powerful ideas. It wants no quarrels among the leaders, among the parties, among the various tendencies. It is animated by the mysticism of unity of action, it wants unity. It wants with all its heart: bread, that is the cessation of unemployment, the solution of the economic crisis, any kind of solution; peace, that is no war against anybody, not even Hitler's Germany; liberty, that is not to

fall under the Nazi club, under the fascist castor oil bottle, and we may add, under Stalin's administrative justice.

Is there, in view of this, a rank and file will that is distinct from the will of the leaders? Is there among the troops of the People's Front a line of thought that is different from the thought or secret expectations of the parties leading the Front?

The revolutionaries who for months have denounced the People's Front do not see this distinction. It is, however, real. It is not the People's Front that must be condemned but the parties that want to lead the People's Front to an objective that is different from the one publicly announced. Evidently a great movement can be led off its course. But is it easy? I don't think so. It will become difficult and even impossible when the masses join clear sight to their enthusiasm.

What is to be done? We must march with the mass. We must keep in step with it. We must not move away from it. It will surprise us more than once. It will even oblige us to run in order to keep up. Isn't that what happened during the last strike movement? Then the masses not only obliged us to run. They recalled from great distances comrades who had long ago left, disgusted with the tendency struggles of the last years.

Without the Popular Front, the last strike explosion would not have taken place. . . . Is that the beginning of the revolution? I am not so optimistic. It is enough for me to recognize that a class is gaining confidence in itself.

—Translated by S. F.

## Strange Case of Jacques Doriot

• N. Sentier

**D**O YOU REMEMBER comrade Doriot?

In 1926 he travelled together with your Earl Browder to far China. The two (and, I think, bluff Tom Mann) were travelling on a commission from Stalin. They were bringing the autographed photograph of Joseph the Great to Chiang Kai-shek, with whom they then smoked cigars of "four-class" alliance over the Kuo Min Tang banquet table.

And before then, in September 1924, it was Doriot who was chosen to put his name to a telegram sent by the French Communists to Abd El Krim of the Rif:

"We salute the brilliant victory of the Moroccan people over the Spanish imperialists. We congratulate their valiant chief Abd El Krim. [We hope that after a conclusive victory over the imperialism of the Spanish dictatorship, he will continue, in liaison with the French and European proletariat, the struggle against all imperialists, including the French, till the complete liberation of the Moroccan soil."

In the course of the same year he told the Chamber of Deputies:

"I am a soldier of honor of the red army, and I am proud of it. If I must take up arms for the Revolution, I shall do so."

And in *l'Humanité* of August 26, 1929:

"We, young communists, are internationalists. The international interests of the working class pass beyond those of the French bourgeoisie.

"We are ready to fraternize with the revolutionary workers of all countries, to aid them in their struggle. We are ready to drop the gun of national imperialism and take up that of the International Revolution."

And in 1931 Doriot, a happy colonel in the army of the C.I., listened to instructions from the general staff and did his bit in the modish persecution of the Trotsky heresy. He had no use for heretics. He was then the mayor and national representative of the revolutionary municipality of Saint Denis. The workers of the

little suburb loved the wholesome fervor of Doriot's speeches. They loved Doriot.

In 1933 Hitler was voted into power. There followed the suppression of the labor movement in Germany. Something awful happened to Doriot. All the while he had been taking orders most cheerfully. The German catastrophe unsettled him. A queer idea began to eat his peace of mind. "What if it was our fault? May be we should not have stuck to that nonsense about a united front from below and the social-democrats being fascists. It is possible that we could have stopped Hitler if we had made an effective united front with the social-democratic organization."

The Communist officials called him names. Doriot became a bitter enemy of his old bosses. He developed a phobia for Moscow. He acquired the notion that the Communist movement was really a nationalist movement in favor of the national interests of Soviet Russia. Internationalism was merely the window dressing by which the workers of the world were fooled into the service of Moscow.

By then the C.I. changed its line, and the Communist Parties adopted Doriot's idea about a united front against fascism. But Doriot had travelled farther. He started to suspect that the Popular Front was actually a war front. He suspected that it was a means of preparing the French masses for a war against Hitler. He said he would not fight for Moscow. Peace with Hitler to spite Moscow!

A few weeks ago Doriot formed a party of his own. Up to now

he functioned politically as the representative of the municipal ward Saint Denis. His new party, the French People's Party, is a national affair. His party, he says, is a workers' party serving the national interests of France. He describes his program as "French communism." He calls for a "national emancipation." He writes in his organ *Emancipation Nationale* (June 29):

"Internationalism in the France of 1936 weakens the popular masses. We cannot be internationalist when others are not. Therefore our party will be national.

"The victory of our party will assure the conditions of normal relations with all other peoples, for by strengthening its national unity, France could discuss on a footing of perfect equality with other countries, etc."

And:

"It is by upholding the national ideal that Mussolini won power, created a strong state and accomplished in ten years social and economic reforms that are as profound as those of the Russians."

Doriot, still fervently supported by the workers of Saint Denis, is travelling farther and farther. Watch Doriot. He has an idea which Colonel Guillaume, the French fascist writing in *Choc*, says: "... should not be limited to Saint Denis but should pass on to the rest of the country. It will pass on."

Wise people already recognize him as the expected "Chief." *Je Suis Partout* (reactionary) writes:

"Doriot is awaited by all France with sympathy and curiosity. Only he can give back to France its confidence in its destiny."

# An Open Letter to André Gide

• Victor Serge

[Victor Serge, a Franco-Russian radical intellectual, was recently freed from his Soviet prison and permitted to leave Russian territory, as a result of a long and tenacious campaign by his friends, who spared neither the old peace-lover Rolland nor the then moribund Gorki. On the way to Paris, Serge penned the following letter to André Gide, who had in the last few years been won over to the doctrine of Intourism.

It appears that Victor Serge feels cheated. The Russian Revolution, which he says was a socialist revolution, did not turn out right. He is dissatisfied with the mass exhibitions of girl gymnasts, the mass spectacles of lady parachutists, the mass testimony of Stakhanovists with shaven polls. He is dissatisfied with the beautiful, enthusiastic, military and civilian parades. He is dissatisfied with the marble subway, the great movie industry, the democratic constitution, the huge and huger statues of Lenin and the vast and vaster portraits of Stalin. He is even dissatisfied with Gorki's villas. Behind those fine things he says he sees: secret police, "isolators," a general fear of one's superiors, capital punishment for minors and sweaty toil for wage workers.

He therefore reports to André Gide, the Western intellectual in chief, that all is not well with intellect in the land whose liberties Lenin described in his pre-election pamphlet: *State and Revolution*. It is interesting to note that Serge, an utopian militant, does not stop to ponder why the revolution he calls socialist did not bring socialism. Neither does he bother to explain the relation of the worker to the product of his labor in the U.S.S.R. These are somewhat earthly things. Surely Gide, the refined old literary gentleman, understands best only what is of the spirit.]

A SHORT while ago you presided in Paris over an international congress of writers assembled for the defense of culture. There arose at this congress the question of the right to think in the U.S.S.R. It seems that the matter came up only in connection with my fate, and was dealt with in opposition to the will of the majority of the delegates. I understand that about the same time you made certain attempts to save my manuscripts, which were held by the censor's office in Moscow. My manuscripts are still in Moscow. There have also remained most of my personal papers, my diaries, my draft work, all the precious scraps that are gathered so fondly in a lifetime. . . . I thank you for the little you have done for me. I thank you for the impartiality you have shown to those of my friends who received the opportunity to defend me at the writers' congress as well as to those who were not permitted to talk. If my personal case interests you, you will find pertinent information in my letter to Magdeleine Paz, a copy of which letter I enclose here. Furthermore, I remain at your service.

The fact is that both you and I are of little account in the drama we participate in. You have finally taken your place among the revolutionists, André Gide. Permit me, a communist, to speak to you frankly about certain conditions that dominate us from above.

I recall pages of your diary of 1932. In them you noted your adhesion to the principles of communism—because it assures the free development of personality. (I reconstitute your ideas from memory). I read those pages in Moscow with a very contradictory feeling. At first, I was quite happy to see come over to the cause of socialism the man whose thinking I had followed—from a dis-

tance, of course—since the enthusiasms of my youth. Then I was broken-hearted by the contrast existing between your affirmations and the reality I was plunged in.

Your diary reached me at a time when not one person around me dared to keep a diary, for any night, without fail, the political police would come to search. So that reading your words, I felt like the soldiers who during the war received in the trenches newspapers from the rear and found in these newspapers fine, lyrical prose about the last war for justice, and other such things. I asked myself if it was possible that you knew nothing at all about the tragedy of a revolution ravaged on the inside by reaction.

At that time no worker could express an independent opinion, no matter how well-intentioned, without being immediately chased out of the party, his trade union, his shop, to be deported or imprisoned. . . . Three years have passed. What years! Years marked by the slaughter that followed the end of Kirov. Years marked by the mass deportation of a part of the population of Leningrad, the imprisonment of several thousand old communists of the first period, by the crowding of concentration camps, which are, unquestionably, the vastest in the world. . . .

If I understand you correctly, my dear Andre Gide, you have always had the courage to live with your eyes open on the world. You cannot close them today on this reality. If you did, you would no longer have the moral right to speak a single word to workers for whom socialism is more than a concept but the work of their flesh, their mind, the very meaning of their existence.

What is the fate of thought in the U.S.S.R.? It has become a dry doctrine, devoid of content, severely imposed in all departments, reduced in all that is printed to the repetition, word for word, or the flattest commentary, of the words of a single man. Written history is reworked yearly from bottom to top; encyclopedias are periodically recast; libraries are purged—in order to strike out the name of a Trotsky, to suppress or besmirch other companions of Lenin. Science has been put at the service of the political opportunism of the moment. The League of Nations is denounced as a base tool of Anglo-French imperialism yesterday. It is revealed today as the instrument of peace and human progress. . . .

What is the fate of the writer? I am referring specifically to the men who profess to speak for the many who cannot express themselves. We have seen Gorki rework his memories of Lenin to have Lenin say in the last edition exactly the contrary of what he said on a certain page of the first. . . . We have a literature managed in its minutest manifestations, and a literary mandarinat admirably organized, sumptuously paid, thinking now this way, now that way, to suit the desires of the top.

As for the others. . . . What has become of the brother in spirit of our great Alexander Blok, the author of the *History of Contemporary Russian Thought*—Ivanov-Razoumnik? He was in prison when I was there, in 1933. It is true that the old symbolist poet Vladimir Piast has finished by committing suicide in deportation? His was a grave crime: he tended toward mysticism. Here, however, are materialists of various shades. What has become of Herman Sandomirski, the author of famous works on Italian fascism, who was condemned to death under the Tsarist regime? In what prison, in what deportation camp, is he, and why? Where is Novomirski, he too a convict under the old regime, the man who initiated the Soviet encyclopedia? He was recently sentenced to spend ten years in a concentration camp. Why? But these two are veteran anarchists. Let me name you some communists, October combatants, intellectuals of the first class (I suffer enough to have to name them). There is Anychev, to whom we owe the only lucid *History of the Civil War* found in Russian. And Gorbachev,

Lelevitch, Vardine, all three literary historians and critics. The four were suspected of sympathy with the Zinoviev tendency. Concentration camps for them. And now for a few Trotskyites, hardest treated because they are the firmest. The following are some of those who have been imprisoned or deported in the last eight years: Fiedor Digelstedt, professor of agronomy at Leningrad; Gregory Yakovine, professor of sociology. And our young and great Solntsev died in January after a hunger strike. . . . I have limited myself here to the mention of some writers. But, my dear André Gide, I should be covering pages and pages with the names of heroes. I am somewhat humiliated to have to make this concession to the caste spirit of men of letters. Forgive me.

What, for example, has become of Bazarov, the pioneer of Russian socialism? For he disappeared five years ago. What happened to Riazanov, the founder of the Marx-Engels Institute? Is the historian Soukhanov, who has given us a monumental history of the revolution of February 1917, dead or alive after his long struggle in prison of Verkhneouralsk? Or what is the price he is paying for the sacrifice of his conscience demanded of him?

And what is the fate of the human being as such in the U.S.S.R.? You feel, undoubtedly, we must go no further. But does any interior peril justify the crazy measures of repression that are continually invented to suit the needs of the Secret Police? Isn't there something appalling about the function of the formidable police apparatus, which, making multitudes of victims, establishes in the Soviet prisons veritable schools of counter-revolution where the citizen of yesterday are changed into the enemies of today?

There is only one explanation. Frightened by the consequences of its own policy, but accustomed to the exercise of absolute power over the masses, without any law, the ruling bureaucracy has lost control of itself. We should touch here on the problem of real wages, generally fallen extremely low. We should consider the matter of worker legislation, in which the rulers' compulsion intervenes with scandalous license. We should speak of the system of hostages, according to which an entire family is struck pitilessly for the misdemeanor of an individual. And we should mention the law that punishes with death the worker who attempts to cross the boundaries of the U.S.S.R. without a passport—and remember that it is impossible for him to obtain a passport to go abroad—and orders the deportation (to Siberia) of all his relatives.

We are asked to make a common front against fascism. How are we to bar the way to fascism with so many concentration camps behind us? Our duty in this connection is, as you see, not very simple. No new conformism, no sacred lie, can stop the oozing of the ulcer. The line of defense of the Revolution is not only on the Vistula and the Manchourian frontier. Just as compelling is the duty to defend the Revolution within the Soviet Union itself in a struggle against the reactionary regime that has installed itself in the proletarian fortress and defrauds the working class of the greater part of its conquests. In one sense only does the U.S.S.R. remain the greatest hope of our time: the Soviet proletariat has not said its last word.

It is quite possible, dear André Gide, that this bitter letter will teach you something. I hope so. I beg you not to close your eyes. Dare to look behind the new marshals, the costly and very clever propaganda, the parades, the spectacles, the congresses. That is only the old world. But there is, on the other hand, the reality of a revolution attacked in its living work. It calls us to its aid. And it cannot be served by concealing the ailment, by having us cover up its face.

No one more than you is so representative of the great *intelligentsia* of the West, which has done much for civilization, but has

much to be pardoned by the proletariat of the world for not having understood the war in 1914, for not recognizing the revolution when it began, for not defending the liberties of the workers later. Now that this section of the population finally turns to the revolution incarnated in the U.S.S.R., its conscience must necessarily

choose between blindness and lucidity. Permit me to assure you that the working class and the U.S.S.R. can be served only in complete lucidity. I beg you, in the name of all those who remain courageous over there, to have the courage of this lucidity.

—Translated by John Haddon.

## French Dramatic Literature and Painting in the 18th Century

• George Plekhanov

*This is the draft of a lecture found among Plekhanov's papers in 1931. It must not be confused with the essay that appeared in English in 1928 under the title of "Sociology of the 18th Century Drama." The first English translation.*

**T**RAGEDY in the 18th century.

Bourgeois drama appears in the 18th century. It is also called sentimental comedy. This mixed genre is something between comedy and tragedy. From where does it spring? Let us see what historians have to say about this.

Brunetière.—*Le Drame Bourgeois*

After the Law Bank crash—not to go back any further—the aristocracy loses ground steadily. One may say that it does everything in its power to discredit itself. Especially important is the fact that it becomes poorer, while the bourgeoisie, the Third Estate, grows richer. The importance of the latter continues to increase. The bourgeoisie becomes aware of its rights. It begins to object to inequality and is agitated over social abuses. As the poet wrote: hate accumulates in the heart and there is a rising thirst for justice. It is hardly possible that having at its disposal such means of propaganda and influence as the theatre, the bourgeoisie would not use it. It is hardly possible that it would not regard with a "tragic" eye the inequalities that are merely sources of amusement to the author of *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* and *Georges Dandin*. And would the bourgeoisie, already triumphant economically, continue to suffer the stage representation of emperors and kings instead of using its money in order to have produced its own portrait for itself?

Thus according to Brunetière, the bourgeois tragedy is born when a third class appears on the scene of French history—the bourgeoisie, which in the 18th century intervenes as an active element in the development of public opinion. This is an interesting and very instructive viewpoint. Let us consider it for a moment.

Brunetière declares: The bourgeoisie could not be satisfied with the stage representation of emperors and kings. Is this true? Let us try to understand the psychology of the partisans of the bourgeois drama.

Beaumarchais.—*Remarques sur la Comédie.*

In his *Remarks on Comedy*, Beaumarchais protests against the fact that only kings are the principal personages of comedy. He exclaims ironically: "To represent the people of the Third Estate in misfortune? Fie on this! It is preferable merely to laugh at them. Grotesque citizens in despair, that is for them the only theatre possible." (Letter concerning the criticism of *Barber of Seville*.) He is protesting here against the choice of characters. But he himself. . .

We see here a protest against the choice of actors, but the author objects even more to the selection of heroes from the Greco-Roman world.

The imitation of antiquity during the Renaissance came as a reaction from feudalism and its ideologists. This tendency continued up to the period of Louis XIV, which began to copy, as we know, not the republican era of Pericles but the monarchic epoch of Augustus. It was easy to compare the century of Louis XIV with the golden age of Augustus. But when the bourgeoisie started to rise against the absolute monarchy, it tended to regard quite sceptically the subjects drawn from the ancient world. Thus Beaumarchais:

"What interest do I, a peaceful citizen of a monarchic State in the 18th century on the eve of a revolution, find in the happenings of Greece and Rome? Can I be seriously concerned about a tyrant of Peloponessus or in a young prince brought as a sacrifice to Aulidus? (Allusion to Racine and his *Iphigénie en Aulide*). Is this a worthy object of study for me? Can I draw a moral gain from such subjects?"

In the bourgeois drama, as in the drama and comedy of today, it is the bourgeois who is the hero. The bourgeois drama was born with Nivel de la Chaussée. About 1750 its development stops at Diderot's products: *Le Fils naturel*, 1757, *Père de Famille*, 1758. It insists not merely on the representation of bourgeois characters but precisely on the representation of social situations. People asked critically: What is a merchant as such, a judge as such? Does not a vocation need the support of character? But it is not the representation of a judge as such and a merchant as such that we have here, but the representation of a judge and merchant of a particular period. Verse gives way to prose. Moral: reaction against the dissolute customs of the Court.

The tragedy created by the aristocracy dominated completely and unquestionably as long as the aristocracy ruled completely and unquestionably (within the limits allowed it by the monarchy, itself the product of a class struggle. See A. Thierry, *Essai sur l'histoire du Tiers-Etat*.) But in the 18th century, as Marx said, the productive forces were in contradiction with the production relations. The epoch of a revolutionary movement for the emancipation of the bourgeoisie. Its repercussion in literature: the appearance of a new literary genre. The bourgeois drama is, according to Brunetière's expression, the portrait of the bourgeoisie painted by itself.

Let us verify this. The bourgeois drama was imported into England from France. Under what conditions did it develop in England?

The Restoration period in England. Great corruption of the nobility. Repercussions in the theatre (comedy). A movement against this moral looseness develops within the bourgeoisie. Repercussions in the theatre. The signal for the movement in the domain of the theatre is given by Blackmore: *Prince Arthur* (1695). The comedy becomes "accessible to Christians." The spread of bourgeois morality: *The Conscious Lovers*. Colley Cib-

ber: *Careless Husband*, Lillo, Moore and others. The French bourgeoisie takes here what best suits its own aspirations.

My viewpoint is confirmed by a long series of studies:

Hermann Hettner: *Geschichte der französischen Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*.

The meaning of this epoch is explained as follows:

The nobility is ruined. It is isolated. The bourgeoisie is strengthened. It assumes a power and an importance it did not have up to then. Alongside of the degenerate nobility, suddenly appear the young forces of the bourgeoisie. The actions and demands of the latter become more important: they can no longer be minimized: The Third Estate reaches even the bases of the Government (that is, the absolute monarchy dominated by the aristocracy). For these new forces, the laws and forms of the State are devoid of meaning. That is why the revolutionary theory first appears in the realm of law and politics.

Chapter III, "Social Contradictions":

The bourgeoisie, which figured in art up to then only as an object of derision for the Court, strives for equal rights in the field of poetic representation. It wins these rights. As a result, art develops in content and form. The contradictions and struggles of the epoch are reflected quite clearly in its heavy novels and its comedies. The nobility was losing out; the Third Estate was acquiring greater importance and authority. Such is the meaning and importance of the social movement of the time. And this is reflected in literature.

Let us consider the painting of the period. I ask: What is the relation of the painter Boucher to the means of production? What tastes did he represent? What was said before us by historians who cannot be accused of Marxism?

Concours:—*Sur Boucher* (On Boucher):

When the period of Louis XV succeeds that of Louis XIV the ideal of art descends from majesty to amenity. The refinement of elegance, the delicacy of voluptuousness spreads everywhere. At that time Boucher makes his appearance. Voluptuousness is Boucher's ideal. It is the soul of his painting. . . . The Venus dreamt and painted by Boucher is only the physical Venus.

I say: That is not enough. There lurks in his painting much coquetry, intended for persons who are worn out and made blasé, from too much pleasure.

Elegant vulgarity—that is Boucher. His is the art of a ruined and sterile court—as noted by Hettner. The movement of the Third Estate takes the form of a reaction against this school. Diderot rails against Boucher in his *Salons*:

Diderot:—*Sur Boucher*:

"With him, the degradation of taste, color, composition, characters, expression, design, kept in step with the degeneracy of customs. In 1765 (according to Diderot) Boucher was no longer an artist and in that year he was named as the first painter to the king." Diderot attacks Boucher's *amours* in particular, and his viewpoint is characteristic. "In this innumerable family you will not find one employed in the real actions of life, in study, reading, writing, stripping of hemp. Wasn't there a time when he was possessed with the fury of making virgins? What kind of virgins were they? Some nice little gossips. And his angels? Little libertine satyrs. . . ."

Diderot contrasts Boucher with Greuze (he praises *Accordée du village*). "Here is your painter and mine, the first among us who had the idea of bringing morals to art." Greuze's paintings are a

pendant of the sentimental comedy (for example *Accordée du village*).

Thus Boucher's painting reflects monarchy at its decline, while Greuze's painting is welcomed by the bourgeois, who rise against the libertinage of the Court. We shall perhaps find it easier to understand David's painting from this viewpoint.

The sentimental comedy and Greuze's painting are really the first steps of the bourgeoisie. Up to then the bourgeoisie appeared to be only virtuous and sentimental. Another step and it will be revolutionary. When the revolutionary tendencies come to the top, we must expect the appearance of an interest in the revolutionaries of other countries and other times, as well as a tendency to imitate them. Ancient literature offers many examples of heroes sacrificing their lives for their country. Therefore the advanced spirits of the Third Estate show a veritable infatuation for the literature of antiquity. Is it therefore astonishing that David paints Brutus condemning his children for treason to the fatherland? (Astonishing that the painting was done in the fulfillment of an official order.) Ernest Chesneau's explanation:

During the last years of the reign of Louis XVI, the general preoccupation with the republics of antiquity introduced into official circles a lively curiosity for the artistic reproduction—plastic, graphic and literary—of the important deeds of Greek and Roman history. In line with this tendency M. Angivilliers, the royal director-general of buildings, ordered the artist to execute the two paintings which definitely assured his reputation: *The Oath of the Horaces* and *The Lictors Bringing to Brutus the Bodies of his Children*.

D'Angivilliers was charmed by the prospect of winning public opinion. Now this public opinion was determined by the social relations of the time; the latter, in their turn, flowed from the development of the economy of the time, the productive forces. Here is Chesneau again:

"David reflects exactly the national sentiment, which applauded itself in its own reflection. The mass was fortifying its own tastes by admiring the work of the artists who pictured for it the heroes it had chosen as its models. This is the reason for the facility with which the revolution taking place in morals and in the social order was paralleled by the revolution in art.

The revolution advances. From little satyrs to Brutus is but a small stretch. This revolution is explained solely by the struggle of classes. But the question here is no longer merely the choice of subject. The artist no longer considers his work the same way. The mannerisms of the old school, the studied elegance and softness of Van Loo. Reaction: severe simplicity. Artists turn again to antiquity in the quest of models. The art that dominated classic antiquity was sculptured (the painting of antiquity has not survived). We find well made statues in David; he was quite proud of them. Later this turns against him; he lacks imagination. Here is a dialectician in art. But that is precisely what was needed then. That is what Diderot insisted on in his *Salons*. Art is now at the service of ideas. David's paintings are *masterpieces of republican pride*. During the Revolution the inclination toward tendency art develops even more. In his report to the Convention on the Academy, which was then said to have the rank of a shop, David said:

"All artistic genres only flatter the vanity and caprices of a handful of sybarites with well-filled pockets. The shops (the Academy) used to ferret out men of genius and in general all those who considered art with correct ideas of morality and philosophy". The art of the old regime is accused of being

the slave of superstition and a plaything in the hands of the powerful of the world. "The republican society of arts"; its aim: to oblige art to serve virtue, that is, republican virtue. In 1793 a jury is created to award prizes. Here is Fleurio: *Fleurio and Hassenfranz on art and art juries:*

They regret that the bas-reliefs exhibited at the competitive exposition are not penetrated with the spirit of the great principles of the revolution. "Yes, and who are generally the people who busy themselves with sculpture while their brothers are shedding their blood for the Fatherland? In my opinion there is no need for prizes." Rebert agrees. Hassenfranz adds: "I shall be frank. I think the artist's talent is in his heart and not in his hands. All that can be assimilated by the hands is of relatively small importance." To the remark of a certain Neveu who says that it is nevertheless necessary to pay attention to the art of the hands (remember we are dealing here with sculpture), Hassenfranz replies excitedly: "Citizen Neveu, the art of the hands is nothing. We must not base our judgment on the skill of the hand." It is decided not to award any prizes. During the discussion on painting, the same Hassenfranz says that the best painters are they who flee abroad.

Fashions and customs. The vogue of Greek costumes. *Les Ridicules*. Conclusions: art for art's sake. We consider the theory of art for art's sake from the viewpoint of theoretic reason. We do not say how it should be but of what it consists. Of what does it consist?

At the time of Louis XIV, art was at the service of social ideas. At the time of Boucher, art existed for art's sake. Under David art made use of social ideas. During the romantic period, again art for art's sake. But the socialists (Saint-Simon for example) demand that art be put at the service of society. The general rule

is that in revolutionary epochs art is at the service of ideas. But we do not say: art should be, etc. From our viewpoint, we ought to content ourselves with analysis. To show the class origin of a given artistic genre means to develop the consciousness of that class which, according to Marx, cannot swerve, cannot move, without shaking the entire social order of today. The immense advantage of our position is that we can be completely objective, that is to say, absolutely true, as true as scientists. At the same time, our words must necessarily influence, by rousing their consciousness, all those who are crushed by the existing order.

#### Conclusions

Art is a means of drawing human beings together. It is also a means of raising them against each other. In a society divided into classes, art expresses what is considered good and important for one class or another. It generally reflects that which preoccupies a class at a given period (its ideas, its tastes and illusions, as Marx put it). In the France of the 17th and 18th centuries, this consciousness—and that is very important—was not religious (in the 18th century it was even anti-religious). In a society divided into classes, this consciousness is most often not decided directly by the economy of the society but by those relations and social needs that develop on the basis of existing economic relations. When art expresses the tendencies of a rising (and therefore revolutionary) class, it constitutes an important element in the struggle of this class for its existence and an important instrument of progress (the school of David before the revolution). When art expresses the tendencies of a class in decline, it does not aid this class in its struggle for existence. It merely distracts its idleness.

Translated by H. J.

## To Our Readers—

A SMALL FUND GUARANTEES THE PUBLICATION OF THE *INTERNATIONAL REVIEW* FOR THREE YEARS, EIGHT ISSUES A YEAR. WE AND YOU ARE INTERESTED IN HAVING A BIGGER "IRA" APPEAR TWELVE TIMES EACH YEAR. THERE IS ONE WAY YOU CAN HELP. GET NEW SUBSCRIBERS. 7000 SUBSCRIBERS WILL FEED A TWELVE-TIMES-A-YEAR "IRA." TALK TO YOUR FRIENDS. TAKE OUT A TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION FOR A FRIEND. EVERY NUMBER OF THE *INTERNATIONAL REVIEW* HAS AN INCOMPARABLE DOCUMENTARY VALUE THAT IS CERTAIN TO INCREASE WITH TIME. DO NOT GIVE AWAY YOUR COPY OF THE *REVIEW*. SHOW IT TO YOUR FRIENDS, ENEMIES, ACQUAINTANCES. WE INVITE ALL TO SUBSCRIBE. HELP! 7000 SUBSCRIBERS!

#### NOTE

We have been asked by Mr. Tinoco Davila to postpone the publication of his article on Mexico till after the solution of the current strike situation.

#### THANKS

We wish to thank the friends who wrote suggesting a special "Supporters' Publication Fund," and explained what they meant with a check for \$50.00.

# books

*ABSCHIED VON SOWJETRUSSLAND* (Goodbye to Soviet Russia). By A. Rudolf. Schweizer Spiegel Verlag, Zuerich. A "factual novel" recounting the revolutionary experiences of one Richard Lengyel.

BY 1933 the stream of Western workers who were on the way to help in the building of socialism in the Soviet Union swelled mightily. There is no doubt that most of the immigrants really believed that they were turning their backs on the old world and were going to participate in the construction of a new social order. Before 1933 a reverse movement was in evidence. Many of the pioneers started on their way home, some merely disgusted with the exaggerations of the Soviet agencies abroad, others seared by their Russian experience and expressing contempt or hatred for the labor movement in general. (Of course, I am not referring to the "red" middlemen and executives who flit back and forth on business, nor to the teachers and social workers filling the In-tourist rubberneck buses in the good old summer time.)

We know that in the United States some of the disappointed pilgrims entered the red-baiting services of Hearst's syndicate. In Germany a good number of them offered their aid to Hitler, then in the electoral race for power. The German communists had been trained to counter the Nazi "Heil Hitler!" with a determined "Heil Moscow!" They had been taught to locate their salvation in the middle of Russia. It was disconcerting to have workers who had spent a year or so in the land of hope rise at public meetings in order to testify that "Moscow" meant "slavery."

Here is a book written by a young Austrian communist who went to Russia in 1931 and did not leave the country till 1935. For several reasons Rudolf's *Abschied* could not have served Hitler's purpose. Neither is it likely to be reprinted by a Hearst. And yet the book is sure to fill with consternation the heart of the uncritical soviet apologist, though only the kind of communist who genuflects three times daily in the direction of the Moscow subway will dare to call it "counter-revolutionary."

The important thing is that Rudolf's book is free from the suspicion of personal resentment. It did not come into being because the author could not get on in the Soviet Union. He is careful to explain that his ability was recognized by the Soviet hierarchy. He worked as the Moscow correspondent of the Paris *Appel des Soviets*. He was a functionary of the central council of the Soviet Trade Unions. He was a functionary of the Red International of Labor Unions. He was an associate editor of the Leningrad *Rote Zeitung*. He was an approved and successful freelance writer, whose earning capacity placed him in the higher levels of Soviet society.

What shattered Rudolf's initial enthusiasm? He states that it was his inability to fall in with the parade. He could not lie to himself. For little by little he came to descry a disturbing fact in the to and fro about him. It was the appalling contradiction between Soviet claims and reality. He reached a stage where he could no longer lull his mind to sleep with the recital of the theory of the transition period. He could not pacify his doubts with the argument that it takes more than two decades to transform the production relations and the morality of a huge country like Russia. He came to the conclusion that the human nature and the backward historic conditions of the country were not entirely responsible for this cleavage between pretense and fact.

He realized that criticism on his part while he remained in the Soviet Union would do him no good. Yet he felt the need of working for socialism. His place as an effective revolutionist, he thought, was outside of the land where the old swindle draped itself in the red flag.

This is a book full of cutting impressions and arresting details. Rudolf records: "want, careerism, sordid self-interest, hypocrisy and, careerism." He notes "the gray army of workers moved here and there without a will of their own." He distinguishes the blind followers from the ideologists of the fodder-bin. He finds in the key-positions cynical bureaucrats who know that they want careers and poke fun at the ideal of socialism. He muses over the great differences of income: thousands of rubles a month for some, a hundred to two hundred for the mass. He describes the disguised prostitution flourishing under the patronage of the G.U.P. commanders, who provide their kept women with luxurious apartments while workers have hardly any floor-space to sleep on. He contrasts the resplendent fronts of the elaborate newly built public buildings with the frightful housing needs of the huddled millions. He reflects on the symbolism of the pompous marble-lined subway, of which all respectable people are so proud, but which ordinary workers cannot use because the price of a ride is 50 kopecks, that is five times as much as the usual street-car fare. And then comes the crescendo of the Kirov assassination, followed by summary arrests, trials at which the accused are not present, hurried executions. Details, gray and lurid, disgusting and sometimes amusing details.

But what is the purpose of a book of this sort? It has surely not been written to divert the lover of Soviet exoticism?

Rudolf ends his personal chronicle—for that is what it is—with the following words:

"Certain it is that this is not a 'transition' to socialism. We have here the stabilization of the usual state of misery, offering possibilities of advancement to the few but not to the mass. It is not socialism that is being built here. No, not even a new, advanced social form. Here private capitalism has been replaced with a highly concentrated state capitalism."

IT IS INTERESTING to note the representative reaction of a typical reviewer and the author's reply to his critic. After recognizing the merits and obvious earnestness of Rudolf's account, Kurt Hiller (in *Sozialistische Warte*, no. 7, 1936) asks:

"But is not a State capitalism which does not allow the surplus to go to a possessing class but instead has it flow back to society as a whole in the form of rest homes, workers' clubs, institutions of learning, kindergartens, homes for the aged, hospitals, sanatoria, stipends for travelling, general possibilities for the enjoyment of art, unusual industrial conditions that render the Workers State independent from foreign countries and provide with means of communication and arms its unsurpassable army of defense—is not such State Capitalism really socialism?"

Here is Rudolf's answer (*Sozialistische Warte*, no. 9, 1936):

"Hiller asks me if State capitalism devoid of a possessing class is not really socialism.

"The Soviet State is a social form whose like has been unknown in history. For this reason we must be careful not to use in our estimation of the U.S.S.R. conceptions that apply to previous forms. Certainly, there is no possessing class in Soviet Russia. The land, industry and commerce are owned and run by the State, and about 70% of the peasantry has been collectivized. But the Russian workers, peasants and small employees get a smaller part of the value of the product of their labor than their brothers in misery

in the private capitalist countries. The surplus value, which under private capitalism is appropriated by the entrepreneurs, is here taken for themselves by the Soviet aristocracy. The latter are not distinguished by their possession of the means of production but by their possession of positions of advantage. They constitute a ruling caste. While under private capitalism land, houses, factories and other enterprises are inherited, it is these positions of social advantage that are inherited in the U.S.S.R. The children of the "people's commissars," the children of the red "marshals," the children of the technical and artistic élite are the heirs presumptive, if not to the exact positions of their parents, then to similar positions within the new élite. The son of a Molotov or a Voroshilov has different life conditions and therefore different opportunities of advancement than the son of the turner Petrov working in the Moscow Stankosavod. So that we have in the Soviet Union the same monopoly of education and the formation of the youth as under liberal capitalism. It is true that in the positions of average importance there remains a certain equality of opportunity. But this will hold only during the period of technical upbuilding, which is entirely conjunctural. And even there the offspring of the strata mentioned above have better possibilities for study and therefore better opportunities for a career than the children of ordinary workers. It is as hard or as easy to enter the highest ten thousand of Soviet society as it is for a newsboy to become a Rockefeller under private capitalism.

"The U.S.S.R. is not on the way to a classless society. There are being created within it new class forms. What must determine our judgment here is wideawake reflection and not dogmatic hair-splitting. Healthy thought will not limit the notion of class to the 'ownership of the means of production.' It must locate it in the difference in the level of means of livelihood and therefore of mentality.

"According to your old dogmatic definition, a miserable cobbler, who with the aid of an apprentice toils for sixteen hours a day in a cellar, is branded as an exploiter and a capitalist, while the general director, or the chief engineer, of a large enterprise, who makes fifty or a hundred times more than the cobbler, who lives in villas and rolls around in luxurious limousines, is an 'employee,' a 'worker'! It is precisely such 'workers' who compose the new Soviet élite. The Russian proletariat, not weighed down with dogma, designates that kind of 'worker' as a 'Soviet boorzhooy.' For the 'Soviet boorzhooy' have the same fine homes, the same autos and the same mentality as their brothers within private capitalism. And they want to keep their positions at any cost.

"And here I come to a point on which I am in unreserved agreement with Hiller's formulation: the lack of an ethical base in the Soviet structure. For the great fighters in the cause of socialism, for Bebel, Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Jaures, Zetkin, for Vera Figner, for the entire army of Bolsheviks under Tsardom and naturally also for Lenin, socialism was an ethical movement, a movement for the conquest of the maximum of justice possible on earth. This is demonstrated by the party 'maximum,' the strict party ethics, the dozens of special measures prescribed to party members during the first eight years after the October revolution.

"Stalin has broken with this outlook.

"He went the way of least resistance.

"He extirpated the socialistic ethic and substituted for it the bare material motive—an incentive that is much stronger and more brutal than that obtaining under private capitalism because it is based on differences surpassing those of the bourgeois world. He considered it 'safer' to create a pretorian guard, which could be depended on to defend its positions—and thus his power—with

tooth and nail rather than to rely on the mass of honest revolutionists.

"Stalin chose the bare material motive as the sole motive to be used in the upbuilding of Russia. He misused the idea of socialism as a mask for 'loyalty to the line.' He used the term 'socialism' as a signboard for a country which is anything but socialist. His policy has created that quagmire of material and intellectual corruption the stink of which has made it impossible for me—and many others—to breathe in the Soviet Union.

"Hiller is quite correct when he refers to the lack of freedom of discussion in Russia as 'one of the unnecessary nuisances.' But without this prohibition of free discussion, Stalin would not be enabled to carry out his policy.

"Since his 'liquidation' of Trotsky we have had a systematic destruction of all inner party democracy, the total destruction of the power of the soviets, their degradation to the status of marionettes in the hands of the ten men of the Politbureau.

"With effective freedom of discussion and opinion, even if limited to the party and the (recently abolished) Communist Youth League, Stalin and his clique would have remained a hopeless minority—in spite of the temptation of good jobs and authoritative positions. Not for nothing were hundreds of thousands expelled from the party, tens of thousands sent into exile, the society of old Bolsheviks, the 'League of Political Prisoners,' the 'Red Partisans'—that is, all organizations with a true revolutionary tradition—dissolved by Stalin.

"You write: 'Do you mean to say that the great efforts to which thousands of the best comrades have devoted their lives will have no effect on history?'

"I may add: 'Have the thousands who have given their lives for the cause of socialism died in vain?'

"I believe that little can be done right now in the Soviet Union. We shall have to begin all over again. That is the question dealt with in the book I am working on at present. I shall call it *The Rediscovery of Europe*.

"We must, I think, learn that the socialist development of the Soviet Union depends on the application of the great revolutionary traditions of Europe, the traditions of the French revolution: freedom, the rights of man, the worth of human dignity, the right to dispose of one's own person. We must spread the knowledge that only on these bases can a better social order be built. We must make all efforts to bring the present holders of power in the Kremlin under the moral compulsion of the advanced free opinion of the world and oblige them by these means to curb its physical and cultural terror and thus make way for the creation of a model social order." (I suppose that Rudolf would say that the new democratic constitution was a part of the general Soviet maskerade.)

It is obvious that here the wounded idealist is speaking. Rudolf finds fault with the present state of affairs in the Soviet Union. He blames it all on Stalin. Is the situation really explained by the power and the nefarious shrewdness of one man and his entourage? What accounts for Stalin? And does not the material development of the U.S.S.R. call for the procedure recognized by Rudolf as a "socialist" maskerade and therefore offers an opportunity for the rule of a Stalin? In the September issue of the *INTERNATIONAL REVIEW*, Mr. Jonathan Ayres will analyze A. Rudolf's and Kurt Hiller's ideas and deal with the question of the construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

---

MODERN DEUTSCHE Buchhandlung, 250 E. 84th St., Regent 4-1522, N. Y. C. The latest German exile periodicals. Books, recent and classics.

INTRODUCTION TO DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM. By Dr. Edward Conze. N.C.L.C., London, 1s.  
DIALECTICS. By T. A. Jackson. Lawrence and Wishart, London, 10s. 6d.

ENGLAND remains for me the country where proletarians themselves have made serious attempts at Marxian scholarship and education. This tendency is represented by the labor colleges, the Socialist Standard, by such personalities as Fitzgerald, MacLean, Casey and Emmet. This tendency has successfully survived the sermons and bible-whanging of the Keir-Hardies, the strikingly Leninist "I have-descended from-Mt. Sinai" complex of the Social Democratic Federation, the ponderous, and at present perfectly useless, tomes of card-cataloguing by the Webb ménage, and the vulgar "Merrie England" ranting of Blatchford. This tendency of the British workers, will no doubt survive the mystic rigmarole styled as Marxism-Leninism that is now mouthed by so many intellectuals "reforged" by the depression.

Jackson's *Dialectics*, selling for 10s. 6d., has been produced for the delectation of the former psycho-analytics and stream-of-consciousness boys and girls now singing the dialectic blues. Dr. Conze's booklet costs but 1s. and is without doubt addressed to workers.

The 1s. book leans wisely on Fred Casey's *Thinking*. It states the four "rules" of procedure followed by scientific thinking and then attempts to apply each to the problems found in the social reality we participate in. But apparently Conze, too, does not forget fashion. As often as he can, he substitutes psalms to Lenin for actual thinking. It is surprising to get the following from a man who apparently wants to do an honest job of popularization:

"In 1916 he (Lenin) was the only one to give full significance to the new features (*Footnote*: monopolies, the export of capital, militarism, etc.) which capitalism has developed by that time. He was also the only one to take advantage successfully of the temporary weakness of capitalism after the War."

In other words Lenin in his wisdom made the Russian Revolution. This is, of course, not Marxian dialectics. It is the very opposite. (It brings to my mind Conze's highly naive: "I know of no general reasons why opposites must always be united.")

Now some of us have read Lenin's pamphlet. It is about the size of Conze's work and for various reasons is not widely read though it is sold by the subsidized publishers all over the world at ridiculously low prices and though Marxist writers like Conze and Jackson always give it as their single source book on the subject of imperialism. We know that Lenin himself forewarned much criticism by stating in his introduction to the pamphlet that it largely was a recapitulation of Hobson's *Imperialism* and Hilferding's *Finance Capital*, both of which were published some time before Lenin's hasty and emotional rehash. There come to my mind words I found in a book that was also published before Lenin's pamphlet:

"Everybody knows the typical phenomena, the exterior characteristics, of the imperialist period; the struggle of the capitalist countries for colonies and spheres of influence, containing sources of raw material and permitting the placement of capital; the prevalent practice of international loans; the eager militarism of our time; protectionism; the preponderance of bank capital and trustified industry. . . ." (It appears, Dr. Conze, that the significance of these new features of capitalism was given before.) "But the socialist movement cannot content itself with an empiric recognition of fact (my emphasis). It must investigate the economic laws of the ensemble of the phenomena that constitute imperialism and uncover its causes. Only an exact theoretic comprehension of

imperialism can give to the program of the proletariat the assurance, the clear sight and the power it must have in order to carry out its historic task."

Lenin's *Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism* (the very title was used before) retails second-hand this *empiric recognition* of certain facts of capitalism. We must not mistake Lenin's shuffling and twisting in his personal attack on Kautsky as original investigation of the "ensemble of phenomena constituting imperialism."

Apparently, the author of the introduction does not forget the customers who must have a Lenin dressing with their dialectics.

T. A. JACKSON'S 10s. 6d. opus repels by its pretension to learning and its glib style. The writer is not merely a Marxist vulgarizer who for commercial reasons salaams at set intervals in the direction of Lenin's rouged cadaver. Here is the boy that made good, the successful Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist who, having learned the rules of the game by heart, never says "Marx and Engels" without adding "and Lenin and Stalin." His dialectics is a party affair or rather the affair of an individual (the *Khozain*—the boss) who pops it over a party hierarchy.

Free from the humility of original scholarship, Jackson reviews the history of philosophy and philosophers, from the Greeks to Stalin. He then exposes the *dialectics of nature and history*, blasting to smithereens Jeans, Eddington and other metaphysically reasoning scientists by means of—quotations from party literature. He repeats the old C.P. formulæ on imperialism and fascism. (In places he is a little out of date. For example, fascism is to Jackson the last effort of capitalism to maintain itself. There is no doubt that instead of going directly to the last C. I. lucubrations he resorted to the dated *Fascism and Revolution* by Palme Dutte.) He annihilates the various rival exponents of materialist dialectics, as Fred Casey and even Dr. Conze. His method of reasoning is not that of Marx, who was more interested in using his writing as a means of bringing order in ideas and thus leading to a correct conclusion. Jackson's is the method of the Leninist, the polemicist, who reflects in order to refute an opponent, the solution being given beforehand by the party texts. In cases where he could have easily disproved opponents, say the Laborites, by resorting to the dialectics of facts, he pulverizes them by means of quotations—Stalin's quotations from Lenin. Jackson's *Dialectics* practically, and fittingly, closes with a paen to the Second Five Year Plan, the end-all and completion, to which history and nature has moved inexorably.

We have considered here a book that is obviously the hack product of a charlatan who does not believe or understand half of the material he has gathered in his huge volume.

In more than one way, the book is "above" workers. Unlike the intellectual, who can flit from Freud to neo-Catholicism to Leninism to Fascism to Jumping Methodism, the worker is made profoundly materialist by his situation as a proletarian. It is true that few workers know their historic position in society. But they always act in accordance with their understanding of their needs. They lack the romantic idealism of the intellectuals, which enables the latter to flit from vogue to vogue and mentally and emotionally recreate for themselves, in the manner of the idealist, the world about them. As a result of the influence of the accelerated development of capitalism, the workers will acquire an understanding as to what are their historic needs. They will then—followed by most of the population—accomplish a socialist revolution. But most workers will always tend to find funny the salvation said to repose in the exotic Byzanthian ritual of the Moscow

Church—in spite of the fact that never before in the history of the labor movement has a missionary organization had so much money, so many salaried professional forces, at its disposal. If Jackson's *Dialectics* is not for workers, the phony Marxists of Bohemia are sure to lap it up. The 10s. 6d. monstrosity has been produced especially for them.

For the serious English-reading worker student who is interested

in discovering Marx's method in order to be able to use it in behalf of the historic task of his class, there remains Casey's *Thinking*. The book is unfortunately out of print, though copies may be bought here and there. We know that no State subsidy will facilitate its republication; the "trade" would probably not consider it a paying proposition. What about the N.C.L.C.?

FREDERICK BREUL.

# Economic Development and Socialism

• Rosa Luxemburg

*This is the sixth chapter of "Reform or Revolution." It is a discussion of Edward Bernstein's book "Theoretic Socialism and Practical Social-Democracy." The next chapter is entitled "Trade Unions, Cooperatives and Political Democracy." Back numbers, containing the preceding chapters, may be obtained by writing to INTERNATIONAL REVIEW, P. O. Box 44, Sta. O, New York, N. Y.*

THE GREATEST conquest of the developing proletarian movement has been the discovery of grounds of support for the realization of socialism in the economic conditions of capitalist society. As a result of this discovery, socialism was changed from an "ideal" dreamt by humanity for thousands of years into a matter of historic necessity.

Bernstein denies the existence of the economic conditions of socialism in the society of today. On this count his reasoning has undergone an interesting evolution. At first he simply contested the rapidity of the process of concentration taking place in industry. He based his position on a comparison of the occupational figures for his purpose, he was obliged to proceed in an entirely summary and mechanical fashion. In the most favorable case, statistics of Germany in 1895 and 1882. In order to use these he could not, even by demonstrating the persistence of middle-size enterprises, weaken in any way the Marxian analysis. For the latter does not suppose, as a condition for the realization of socialism, either a definite rate of concentration of industry—that is, a definite delay of the realization of socialism—or, as we have already shown, the absolute disappearance of small capitals, usually described as the disappearance of the small bourgeoisie.

In the course of that latest development of his ideas, Bernstein furnishes us, in his book, a new assortment of proofs: the statistics of shareholding societies. These statistics are used in order to prove that the number of shareholders increases constantly, and, as a result, the capitalist class does not become smaller but grows bigger. It is astonishing that Bernstein has so little acquaintance with his material. And it is astonishing how poorly he utilizes the existing data in his own behalf.

If he wanted to disprove the Marxian law of industrial development by referring to the condition of shareholding societies, he should have resorted to entirely different figures. Anybody who is acquainted with the history of shareholding societies in Germany knows that their average foundation capital has diminished almost constantly. Thus while before 1871 their average foundation capital reached the figure of 10.8 million marks, it was only 4.01 million marks in 1871, 3.8 million marks in 1873, less than a million from 1882 to 1887, 0.52 million in 1891 and only 0.62 million in 1892. After this date, the figures oscillated around 1 million marks, falling to 1.78 in 1895 and to 1.19 in the course of the first half of 1897. (Van der Borgh: *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, I.)

These are surprising figures. Using them, Bernstein hoped to show the existence of a counter-Marxian tendency for the retransformation of large enterprises into small ones. The obvious answer to his attempt is the following. If you are to prove anything at all by means of your statistics, you must first show that they refer to the same branches of industry. You must show that small enterprises really replace large ones, that they do not, instead, appear only where small enterprises or even artisan industry were the rule before. This, however, you cannot show to be true. The statistical passage of immense shareholding societies to middle-size and small enterprises can be explained only by referring to the fact that the system of shareholding societies continues to penetrate new branches of production. Before, only a small number of large enterprises were organized as shareholding societies. Gradually shareholding organization has won middle-size and even small enterprises. Today we can observe shareholding societies with a capital below 1000 marks.

Now what is the economic significance of the extension of the system of shareholding societies? Economically the spread of shareholding societies stands for the growing socialization of production under the capitalist form—socialization not only of large but also of middle-size and small production. The extension of shareholding does not therefore contradict Marxist theory but, on the contrary, confirms it emphatically.

What does the economic phenomenon of a shareholding society actually consist of? It represents, on one hand, the unification of a number of small fortunes into a large capital of production. It stands, on the other hand, for the separation of production from capitalist ownership. That is, it denotes that a double victory is being won over the capitalist mode of production—but still on the capitalist base.

What is the meaning, therefore, of the statistics cited by Bernstein, according to which an ever greater number of shareholders participate in capitalist enterprises? These statistics go to demonstrate precisely the following: at present a capitalist enterprise does not correspond, as before, to a single proprietor of capital but to a number of capitalists. Consequently, the economic notion of "capitalist" no longer signifies an isolated individual. The industrial capitalist of today is a collective person, composed of hundreds and even of thousands of individuals. The category "capitalist" has itself become a social category. It has become "socialized"—within the framework of capitalist society.

In that case, how are we to explain Bernstein's belief that the phenomenon of shareholding societies stands for the dispersion and not the concentration of capital? Why does he see the extension of capitalist property where Marx saw its suppression?

This is explained as a simple economic error. By "capitalist," Bernstein does not mean a certain category of production but the right to property. To him, "capitalist" is not an economic unit but

a fiscal unit. And "capital" is for him not a factor of production but simply a certain quantity of money. That is why in his English sewing thread trust he does not see the fusion of 12,300 persons with money into a single capitalist unit but 12,300 different capitalists. That is why the engineer Schulze whose wife's dowry brought him a large number of shares from stockholder Mueller is also a capitalist for Bernstein. That is why for Bernstein, the entire world seems to swarm with capitalists.\*

Here, too, the theoretic base of his economic error is his "popularization" of socialism. For this is what he does. By transporting the concept of capitalism from its production relations to property relations, and "by speaking of simple individuals instead of speaking of entrepreneurs," he moves at the same time the question of socialism from the province of production into the domain of relations of fortune—that is, from the relation between Capital and Labor to the relation between poor and rich.

In this manner we are merrily led from Marx and Engels to the author of the *Evangel of the Poor Fisherman*. There is this difference, however. Weitling, with the sure instinct of the proletarian, saw in the opposition between the poor and the rich, class antagonisms in their primitive form, and wanted to make of these antagonisms a lever of the movement for socialism. Bernstein, on the other hand, locates the realization of socialism in the possibility of transforming the poor into rich. That is, he locates it in the attenuation of class antagonisms and consequently in the small bourgeoisie.

TRUE, BERNSTEIN does not limit himself to the statistics of incomes. He also furnishes us with statistics of economic enterprises, especially those of the following countries: Germany, France, England, Switzerland, Austria and the United States. But these statistics are not the comparative figures of *different periods* in each country but of each period in different countries. We are not therefore offered (with the exception of Germany, where he repeats the old contrast between 1895 and 1882) a comparison of the statistics of enterprises of a given country at different epochs but the *absolute* figures for different countries: England in 1891, France in 1894, United States in 1890, etc.

He reaches the following conclusion: "Though it is true that large exploitation is already supreme in industry today, nevertheless, represents—in a country as developed as Prussia—including the enterprises dependent on large exploitation—only half of the population occupied in production." This is also true about Germany, England, Belgium, etc.

What does he actually prove here? He proves not the existence of such or such a *tendency of economic development* but merely

\*Nota bene! Bernstein evidently finds in the great diffusion of small shares a proof that social wealth is beginning to pour shares on all little men. Indeed, who but small bourgeois and even workers, could buy shares for the bagatelle of one pound sterling or 20 marks? Unfortunately his supposition rests on an error of calculation. We are operating here with the nominal value of shares instead of operating with their market value, something entirely different. For example, on the mining market, the South-African Rand mine shares are on sale. These shares, like most mining values, are quoted at one pound sterling or 20 paper marks. But already in 1899 they sold at 43 pounds sterling, that is to say, not at 20 but 860 marks. And it is so in all cases. So that these shares are perfectly bourgeois, and not at all small bourgeois or proletarian, "bonds on social wealth," for they are bought at their nominal value only by a small minority of shareholders.

the *absolute relation of forces* of different forms of enterprise, or put in other words, the absolute relation of the various classes in our society.

Now if one wanted to prove in this manner the impossibility of realizing socialism, his reasoning would have to seek the backing of that theory according to which the result of social efforts is decided by the relation of the numerical material forces of the elements in struggle, that is, by the factor of *violence*. Here Bernstein, who always thunders against Blanquism, himself falls into the grossest Blanquist error. There is this difference, however. To the Blanquists, who represented a socialist and revolutionary tendency, the possibility of the economic realization of socialism appeared quite natural. On this possibility they built the chances of a violent revolution—even of a small minority. Bernstein, on the contrary, infers from the numerical insufficiency of a socialist majority, the impossibility of the economic realization of socialism. The social-democracy, however, *does not expect to attain its aim either as a result of the victorious violence of a minority or through the numerical superiority of a majority. It sees socialism come as a result of economic necessity—and the comprehension of that necessity—leading to the suppression of capitalism by the popular masses*. And this necessity manifests itself above all in the anarchy of capitalism.

WHAT IS BERNSTEIN'S position on the decisive question of anarchy in capitalist economy. He denies only the great general crises. He does not deny the partial and national crises. In other words, he refuses to see a great deal of this anarchy; he notices only a little of it. He is—to use Marx's illustration—like that foolish virgin who had a child "who was only very small." But the misfortune is that in such matters as economic anarchy, little and much are equally bad. If Bernstein recognizes the existence of a little of this anarchy, we may point out to him that as a result of the mechanism of market economy, this bit of anarchy is extended to unheard of proportions, to end in collapse. But if Bernstein hopes, while maintaining the system of commodity production, to transform gradually this bit of anarchy into order and harmony, he again falls back into one of the fundamental errors of bourgeois political economy, according to which the mode of exchange is independent of the mode of production.

This is not the place for a lengthy demonstration of Bernstein's surprising confusion about the most elementary principles of political economy. But there is a point—to which we are led by the fundamental question of capitalist anarchy—that must be clarified immediately.

BERNSTEIN DECLARES that Marx's law of surplus value is a simple abstraction. In political economy a statement of this sort obviously constitutes an insult. But if surplus value is only a simple abstraction, if it is only a figment of the mind—then every normal citizen who has done his military duty and pays regularly his taxes has the same right as Karl Marx to fashion his individual absurdity, to make his own law of value. "Marx has as much right to neglect the qualities of commodities till they are no more than the incarnation of quantities of simple human labor as have the economists of the Boehm-Jevons school to make an abstraction of all the qualities of commodities outside of their utility."

That is, for Bernstein Marx's social labor and Menger's abstract utility are quite similar—pure abstractions. But Bernstein forgets completely that Marx's abstraction is not an invention. It is a discovery. It does not exist in Marx's head but in market economy. It has not an imaginary existence, but a real social existence,

so real that it can be cut, hammered, weighed and put in the form of money. The abstract human labor discovered by Marx is, in its developed form, no other than *money*. That is precisely one of the greatest of Marx's discoveries, while for all bourgeois political economists, from the first of the mercantilists to the last of the classicists, the essence of money has remained a mystic enigma.

The Boehm-Jevons abstract utility is, in fact, only a conceit of the mind. Or more correctly, it is a representation of intellectual emptiness, a private absurdity, for which neither capitalism nor any other society can be made responsible but vulgar bourgeois economy itself. Hugging their brain-child, Bernstein, Boehm and Jevons, and the entire subjective fraternity, can remain twenty years or more before the mystery of money, without arriving at a solution that is any different from the one reached by any cobbler, namely that money is also a "useful" thing.

Bernstein has lost all comprehension of Marx's law of value. Anybody with a small understanding of Marxian economics can

see that without the law of value, Marx's doctrine is incomprehensible. Or to speak more concretely—for him who does not understand the nature of the commodity and its exchange, the entire economy of capitalism, with all its concatenations, must necessarily remain an *enigma*.

What is precisely the key which has enabled Marx to open the door to the secrets of capitalist phenomena and so solve, as if in play, problems that were not even suspected by the greatest minds of classic bourgeois political economy? It is his conception of capitalist economy as an historic phenomenon—not merely in the sense recognized in the best of cases by the classic economists, that is, in so far as it concerned the feudal past of capitalism—but also in so far as it concerns the socialist future of the world. The secret of Marx's theory of value, of his analysis of the problem of money, of his theory of capital, of the theory of the rate of profit, and consequently of the entire existing economic system, is found in the transitory character of capitalist economy, the inevitability of its collapse, leading—and this is only another aspect of the same phenomenon—to socialism. It is only because Marx looked at capitalism from the Socialist's viewpoint, that is, from the historic viewpoint, that he was enabled to decipher the hieroglyphics of capitalist economy. And it is precisely because he took the socialist viewpoint as a point of departure for his analysis of bourgeois society, he was in the position to give a scientific base to the socialist movement.

This is the measure by means of which we must evaluate Bernstein's remarks. He complains of the "dualism" "found everywhere in Marx's monumental work." "The work wishes to be a scientific study and prove, at the same time, a thesis that was completely elaborated a long time before the editing of the book; it is based on a schema that already contains the result to which he wants to lead. The return to the Communist Manifesto (that is to the socialist goal! R.L.) proves the existence of vestiges of utopianism in Marx's doctrine."

But what is Marx's "dualism" if not the dualism of the socialist future and the capitalist present? It is the dualism of Capital and Labor, the dualism of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It is the scientific reflection of the dualism existing in bourgeois society, the dualism of the class antagonism writhing inside the social order of capitalism.

Bernstein's recognition of this theoretic dualism in Marx as "a survival of utopianism" is really a naive avowal on his part that he denies the historic dualism of bourgeois society, that he denies the existence of class antagonisms in capitalism. It is an avowal that socialism has become for him only a "survival of utopianism." What is Bernstein's "monism"—Bernstein's unity—but the eternal unity of the capitalist regime, the unity of the former socialist who has renounced his aim and has decided to find in bourgeois society, one and immutable, the goal of human development?

Bernstein does not see in the economic structure of capitalism the development that leads to socialism. But in order to conserve his socialist program at least in form, he is obliged to take refuge in an idealist construction, placed outside of all economic development. He is obliged to transform socialism itself from a definite historic phase of social development into an abstract "principle."

That is why the "cooperative principle"—the meager decantation of socialism by which Bernstein wishes to garnish capitalist economy—appears as a concession made not to the socialist future of society but to Bernstein's own socialist past.

*Translated by G.*

#### SUBSCRIPTION RATES

### International Review

12 issues: U.S.A. \$1.50; Canada and Foreign \$1.75.

8 issues: U.S.A. \$1.00; Canada and Foreign \$1.25.

Agents and dealers are asked to write for subscription discounts and bundle rates.

Address all requests to—

P. O. Box 44, Sta. O,  
New York, N. Y.

### Books Abroad

*An International Quarterly of Comment on Foreign Books. Edited by Roy Temple House and Kenneth C. Kaufman.*

The magazine presents each quarter an indispensable index to the literary and intellectual activities of the non-English speaking countries. Leading articles, reviews, comment written by some of the most distinguished critics of America and Europe. It is a vital and interesting contribution to world letters.

Subscription rates: \$2.00 a year; \$3.00 for two years; 50 cents a single copy. Address the Circulation Manager *Books Abroad*.

University of Oklahoma Press

NORMAN, OKLAHOMA